

REMARKS

Applicant's Attorney would like to thank Examiner Green for the helpfulness and courtesy he extended during a telephone interview conducted on February 22, 2006, at which time this Amendment was discussed. Although no final agreement was reached during this interview, the Applicant believes that this Amendment is consistent with the discussions and suggestions made during this interview and places Claims 1-11 and 13-20 in condition for allowance.

As now amended, Claim 1 specifically defines the advertising/promotional display system of the present invention in a manner which Applicant believes clearly and unequivocally distinguishes the present invention from the prior art references. In this regard, amended Claim 1 specifically defines the advertising/promotional display system of the present invention as comprising a housing formed by a plurality of cooperating panels, with a first support plate and a second support plate mounted inside of the housing. Furthermore, amended Claim 1 details each elongated support plate as comprising a first section which is affixed to an inside surface of a first panel of the housing and a second section which extends from the first section into the interior of the housing, independent of any other member and terminating with a free end. In addition, the free ends of each of the support plates is specifically defined as being interconnected to each other. In this way, as also detailed in Claim 1, a support

structure is attained for securely holding and controllably moving an arm member mounted thereto which activates the audio signal generating assembly when desired.

The Applicant maintains that the unique construction for the first support plate and the second support plate as now fully detailed in amended Claim 1 is incapable of being taught or suggested by the prior art references upon which the Examiner has relied. In this regard, the principal reference, namely France '776, appears to incorporate a single arm member extending from a wall member of the housing which cooperates with sound generating means. However, there is clearly no teaching or suggestion in France '776 which would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to construct a display system with a first support plate and a second support plate, with each support plate comprising two separate sections. Furthermore, each support plate is defined as being independently mounted at one of its separate sections to the interior of a housing forming panel. Finally, the remaining section of each support plate is defined as extending into the interior of the housing independent of any other member, with the free end of the opposed side of each of the support plates being securely affixed to each other. In this way, a separate support structure is achieved which is capable of retaining the arm member and controlling the movement of the arm member relative to the audio signal generating assembly whenever the housing is moved between its collapsed configuration and its fully erect position.

In view of the unique construction defined in amended Claim 1, the Applicant believes that Claim 1 is now clearly in condition for allowance. In addition, as

suggested by the Examiner, an amended paragraph has been inserted into the specification in order to clearly define the structure of each of the support plates now defined in amended Claim 1 and clearly shown in the drawings originally submitted with this application.

Claims 2-11 and 13-15 are all dependent upon Claim 1 and add novel combinations thereto. For this reason, as well as the reasons detailed above in reference to Claim 1, the Applicant believes that these dependent claims are also in condition for allowance.

Claim 16 is an independent claim and has been amended in a manner substantially identical to the amendment discussed above in reference to Claim 1. In addition to the detailed limitations incorporated to Claim 1, Claim 16 has been amended to define the first support plate and the second support plate as comprising separate and independent elements. This additional limitation is believed to further distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art and clearly places Claim 16 in condition for allowance.

Claims 17-20 are all dependent upon Claim 16 and add novel combinations thereto. For this reason, as well as the reasons detailed above in reference to Claim 16, the Applicant believes that these dependent claims are also in condition for allowance.

Based upon the foregoing amendment and the arguments set out herein, the Applicant believes that the pending claims are now all in condition for allowance and an early notice of allowability is earnestly solicited. If any questions remain which may

be resolved in a telephone interview, Applicant's undersigned Attorney would gladly discuss such issues with the Examiner at the Examiner's convenience. For this purpose, Applicants undersigned Attorney has provided his telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Melvin I. Stoltz
Registration No. 25,934
Attorney for Applicant

MIS:rpr
(203) 874-1883